



Town of Jericho
Development Review Board

Town of Jericho
Development Review Board
Jericho Town Hall
Thursday, July 9, 2015

Minutes

Members Present: Barry King, Joe Flynn, Jeff York, Christopher West
Members Absent: Stephanie Hamilton
Guests: Michelle Patrick (Zoning Administrator), Amy Richardson (Secretary)
Public: Bob Provost, Lucy Bathalon, Paul Bathalon

MEETING AGENDA

- A request by Lucy and Paul Bathalon for Conditional Use Review of an accessory apartment. The parcel is located at 37 Old Pump Road in the Agricultural Zoning District.
- A request by Gabriel Handy for Sketch Plan Review of a two lot subdivision. The property is located at 374 Vermont Route 15 in the Village Center Zoning and Character Based Zoning Districts.

Mr. King called the public meeting to order at 7:02 p.m. He read the warning. He asked the members to disclose any conflicts of interest. There was none. Mr. King read the Interested Persons Law. The public was sworn in at 7:06 p.m.

1. A request by Lucy and Paul Bathalon for Conditional Use Review of an accessory apartment. The parcel is located at 37 Old Pump Road in the Agricultural Zoning District.

Applicant's Presentation

Ms. Bathalon stated they would like to build a small accessory dwelling for their daughter who lives with them, noting that three generations are living with them. She said they would like to build an accessory dwelling similar to what Evergreen Herb did on her property. She stated it is approximately 900 square feet. Ms. Bathalon said it is a one bedroom with a den. She stated they have had it perked, noting that Justin Willis is the engineer. She said everything perked just fine and they received the water test back today.

Mr. Bathalon asked if the DRB needed copies. Mr. King responded no, saying if this is approved there would be a condition in the approval that you present the State wastewater and potable water permits before obtaining a building permit. He stated that is how they interlock because all of the water and sewer is State permits, not Town, we don't get involved in that. Ms. Bathalon stated in speaking to the engineer today, he said he was just waiting for the water. She said hopefully that will be taken care of this week. She noted they plan on building this themselves.

Board Questions

Mr. King said we can ask the factual questions to get the information in the record. He asked about the size. Mr. West said it is 994 on the application. Mr. King asked about the square footage of the main house. Mr. Bathalon stated it is a little over 3,000 square feet. Mr. King said he assumes they have looked at the staff memo. Mr. Bathalon agreed they had. Mr. Flynn asked if they would be

sharing a well. Ms. Bathalon said yes, noting that Justin Willis designed two septic systems: one for the new little house and a new one for the big house. She said because they are sharing the water, there is some bubble around it, so he has designed two systems. Mr. Bathalon said everyone has the plan, indicating the location of the existing septic system, leach field, and well. He said in order to feed the new house Justin has designed a system with a pump station out to our field. He stated they will be putting in two septic systems for this project.

Mr. Flynn said with regards to setbacks and so on, you stated you meet them. He said in looking at Justin's plan, he just has the tax map. He asked how comfortable they are with the property lines as shown that everything is outside the setbacks. Ms. Bathalon responded they are very confident. Mr. Bathalon agreed, saying the little house doesn't come close to any one of their property lines. He indicated on the plan the closest property line. Ms. Patrick said it is about 175'. Mr. Flynn said the dimensions on the lot in the right place; clarified the configuration of the boundaries are based on a tax map. Mr. Bathalon agreed. Mr. Flynn clarified there has been no boundary work, but they feel confident this line lines up with the hedgerow in between the properties. Mr. Bathalon agreed.

Mr. West stated that one of the requirements of building a new building is to comply with the Vermont Residential Building Energy Code. He asked if they have made themselves aware of what that code is and will be building to the minimum, if not better than the energy code. Mr. Bathalon said he hasn't heard of that, but he will look into that. Mr. West explained what the code prescribes. Ms. Patrick stated that before they get a certificate of occupancy, they will need to see that it has been submitted. Mr. Bathalon asked if the DRB will need actual blue prints. Mr. West described the way it works. Mr. King stated it is self-certification, noting he noticed the building supply stores have the forms. Mr. West stated the Town has the forms also.

Mr. Bathalon clarified that when they say they are building it themselves, that is just the structure part of it. He stated they will be hiring an electrician and a plumber. Ms. Bathalon agreed, describing the anticipated family involvement and qualifications. Mr. Flynn said one of the requirements is a member of the family, saying that those limitations have to be set and connected to this land. He clarified that if they sell it that is a limitation on the sale. Ms. Bathalon clarified her understanding of the requirement. Mr. Flynn clarified, noting that would be a condition.

Mr. York asked why they have move their septic. Mr. Bathalon responded that the existing one falls within the envelope in order to bring water from their well to the new structure. Mr. Flynn explained there is a separation between the well and the septic field. Mr. King clarified it doesn't meet the present regulations as it is right now, noting it may or may not be safe. The DRB members discussed the reasons further. Ms. Bathalon stated they don't have any objections to that at all. Mr. West asked if they would be putting in any power lines from the house to the new structure underground. Mr. Bathalon stated the power runs along the northern edge to a station above ground, indicating the location on the plan. He said it is underground to the main house and they will put underground to this one. He noted they were talking to their electrician today about that.

Mr. King said they are adjacent to, or partially in the wetlands overlay district. He said there is enough information to show they are outside of that, noting there is not really a survey. He said we have to understand what the limits of error are of the present lines. Mr. West asked if we have the overlay. Mr. King clarified he was talking about the building envelope with respect to the wetlands overlay. He asked Ms. Patrick if she has enough information to determine that. Ms. Patrick responded yes, saying they are clearly outside of that.

Mr. West said one of the things we always ask people who are building to do is to follow the State minimum disturbance rules, which would be a condition. Mr. King clarified the rules Mr. West was referring to are the stormwater management rules. He stated there are a set of State standards for managing the construction project. He discussed how the standards apply, noting it is standard for the DRB to condition that they use those guidelines to manage the site. Mr. West noted the rules are online. Mr. King stated they are not onerous, discussing the types of standards.

Mr. West asked what a mechanic pit is. Ms. Bathalon explained what it is, noting her father uses it. Mr. King said Mr. Willis put it on the plan because it is significantly deep. Mr. West asked about the shed being moved, whether it would be moved to a different property. Mr. Bathalon indicated the new location on the plan, noting it is basically a one stall horse barn. Mr. West clarified there is no foundation. Ms. Bathalon responded no, just dirt. Mr. Bathalon said they already cleared the trees.

Mr. King closed the hearing. He told the applicants they would receive a decision within 45 days, noting it is usually sooner. Mr. Bathalon asked about the next steps and timing. The DRB members discussed the next steps and timing with the applicants.

2. A request by Gabriel Handy for Sketch Plan Review of a two lot subdivision. The property is located at 374 Vermont Route 15 in the Village Center Zoning and Character Based Zoning Districts.

Applicant's Presentation

Mr. Provost stated he is here on the applicant's behalf because he had to leave town. He stated the new zoning ordinance is pretty interesting. He asked whether site plan review is next when you do sketch plan review. Ms. Patrick said no, the subdivision and the development plan will be a preliminary review, noting that final review isn't necessarily needed because it is a minor subdivision. She stated the new regulations require development plan review, but this wouldn't be subject to site plan review. She said the architectural standards are worked in with that, so parts of it might seem like site plan review.

Mr. Provost said gave an overview noting that this is a two lot subdivision, which is considered a minor subdivision. He indicated on the plan the division line between Lot 1 and Lot 2. He said both lots meet the dimensional requirements, but there will be some issues from the staff report that address the lack of consistency with the ordinance for the placement of the home; noting he will discuss it further and they will modify that.

Mr. Provost said there is an existing home on Lot 2, which has been completely renovated. He stated there is an existing curb cut and driveway going into the garage for Lot 2. He said the proposal is that Lot 1 would share the access and create a new driveway going in to this new lot. Mr. Provost indicated the location of the Church on the plan, saying they are benefited by an easement that crosses Mr. Handy's property, noting it is recorded. He stated the Church accesses the rear of Mr. Handy's property by virtue of this easement. He added that the right to use this parking area on the back of Mr. Handy's property is silent as to any recorded documents.

Mr. Provost stated Mr. Handy wants to allow them to use it the way they have been using it. He said they may have some definitive language that defined what the use is because if he conveys this it will be subject to that parking. He said what they are looking at under the new code has to do with what he understands to be a first tier criteria, second tier, and third tier; noting he will refer to the first tier as the front yard, the second tier where the structure would be, and the third tier being the rear yard.

Ms. Patrick noted the language in the regulations calls them lot layers. Mr. Provost stated the first layer, the staff comments wants this house wants to be a little further forward, which is no problem. He said the architectural standards ask for porches, not to be any less than 8' deep. He said that is a functioning front porch which would go on the front of this. Mr. Provost said that in effect pulls this whole structure into the layer you are looking for and that is what they will do to meet the requirements of the new zoning. He said what he is talking about is where you put that house. He said instead of front yard, side yard, and rear yard setbacks; they are defining it as layers and what you do with each layer.

Mr. Provost stated it is designed to create a neighborhood, which is pedestrian friendly. He said it is not a problem accommodating that. He said when they put that 8' porch on there, it pretty much lines up with the neighboring houses. Mr. Provost said regarding access, the staff report recommended that if it does come in off here, that it be pulled back behind the house so that you are 40' deeper. He submitted some pictures to the DRB of what it would look like if they did that. He stated he does not think that is the best way to go, noting there is a discrepancy in where the property owner thought the property line was and where it is actually located.

Mr. Provost said that discrepancy gave him an access point with an existing curb cut off Route 15 that would allow them to put the driveway in the rear yard as staff recommends. He said they can do that and he will leave a plan that shows that. He said what that also does, is it eliminates the requirement of an easement on this property. Mr. Provost stated there is not a lot of stacking distance, so he thinks it is less safe. He said it makes more sense in simplifying what you would have to do to come in off here and come in here; primarily safety issues. He said they concur with the staff report and will offer to put the driveway back here, noting they will move the septic tank over and make sure they have the proper setbacks.

Mr. Provost stated there would be parking for two cars. He said Mr. Handy has applied for his wastewater permit. He said the water is across the street and if he bored under the road as it is indicated, he would need a permit from the Agency of Transportation to obtain permission to bore under the street. Mr. Provost said they were talking about what feeds this house and there is an existing water line. He stated it if is a 1" water line, with the blessing of the municipal water system, they could tap into that water line and wouldn't need that permit. He said that is why you don't see it in front of you.

Mr. King clarified that in either case they would be asking for a new connection to the municipal water, which is a permit process that they do, which would be the water supply. He said they are talking about a septic system design to get an approved sewage disposal permit. He stated as he mentioned in the previous hearing, none of that is in our jurisdiction, but we condition that they be done. Mr. Provost said they are asking for subdivision of the land, with the statement that they will address to the best of their abilities the architectural standards, which he thinks is the next layer of requirements in the new zoning. He stated the first is where we put everything on the lot and whether they meet the requirements dimensionally. He said now what is it going to look like, which is the architectural standards.

Mr. Provost said you get that kind of stuff in the old districts, where you want historic preservation. He stated there are a lot of older houses along there. He said he drove up and down the street, trying to get a rhythm for what is going on there. Mr. Provost said he thinks that the house pictures he showed the DRB is not far off from what they would propose if they saw a rendering of a form-based

home. He said they could orient that building turned 90 degrees, or keep the face of it as it is, noting it is really a matter of preference and what is in rhythm with the neighborhood. He said there is not a lot of rhythm to what is going on up and down the street other than they are older houses, architecturally pretty, and we can tackle the architectural elements.

Board Questions

Mr. King said for purpose of sketch review, what we want to understand is that there is nothing stopping them from adequately meeting the standards. He said it would be useful to go through it in a broad brush approach, but he doesn't think we need to go into a ton of detail at sketch. He explained the purpose of this hearing is to make sure what they are trying to do is possible under the regulations.

Mr. Provost stated he would like to ask, because this is a minor subdivision where we are talking about structural enhancements and architectural details, if we can go from sketch to final review. Mr. King said what we would call that is combining preliminary and final into one hearing, procedurally. He said he doesn't think there is any reason we cannot do that under the new regulations. He asked Ms. Patrick if there is a reason not to combine them. Ms. Patrick responded not that she is aware of, noting that preliminary and final are only required for major subdivisions. Mr. Provost went on the record requesting going from sketch to final review. Mr. King explained how to do that procedurally.

Mr. Provost suggested going through the staff report and making general comments. Mr. King asked if anyone on the DRB had questions about the site, site plan, the division line, access, or anything else. Mr. Flynn said he had a question regards to Route 15 and the setbacks. He asked if the intent is to maximize that setback and be as close as they can to the setback. Mr. Provost responded no, the new ordinance wants this stuff closer to the street than we are used to. He said sometimes when you can't accomplish that, you try to take the average of what is on the street. He stated the staff comments said we would like you to pull it closer to the street, so that is what they are going to do.

Mr. Flynn said he is asking for consistency. Mr. Provost said he doesn't know if it is a three rod road, but he would be surprised if it isn't because it is an old road. Ms. Patrick said she is pretty sure that Route 15 is a four rod road. Mr. King stated there is precedent that it has been treated as a four rod road. Ms. Patrick said in the new regulations, it is more of a range. She said the regulations are trying to create this neighborhood feel, keeping the houses closer together. She said there is a range and they don't want you to be too far back either. Ms. Patrick said in the staff report the dimensions are 15' to 25' for the front yard setback. She said they don't want every house on the street to be too different.

Mr. King clarified that is a guideline with respect to the right of way, which is the whole point about the width of the road; that does push you back and forth. Mr. Provost said you also have in the ordinance a requirement that the steps cannot be any closer than 5'. He said that will keep them back a little bit too. He said in the range of setback is 15' to 25' and they are at 20'; noting if you add the 8' porch, then we are at 20', which is what the setback is for the next houses and is in rhythm.

Mr. Flynn said he is pretty confident it is a four rod through there. He said the plan doesn't show the other side, so he cannot scale it. Mr. Provost stated he is not sure that is even a criterion we need to worry about at this point in time. He said they are showing the property line, which is going to be the edge of that three or four rod road. Mr. Flynn said he doesn't want them to combine the reviews and show a three rod road if it is a four rod road, which would require more conditions.

Mr. Provost said he thinks they are okay; noting what's interesting is the other houses would have that same problem and they have been there for a hundred years. He said he doesn't know what is more important: set the house back from the others to give you distance from the edge of your right of way; or to keep it in rhythm with the rest of the houses. He stated he thinks Form-based Code wants it to be in rhythm with what is there, noting the Town wants to do a pedestrian path. Mr. King stated the point is just that when it comes to making legal documents with monumentation for the subdivision, it's going to matter. Mr. Provost agreed, saying this is a survey, not a tax map, so he thinks we are okay.

Mr. York asked what the minimum size of a subdivision in that area. Ms. Patrick responded it is ¼ acre zoning, noting it is still subject to the Village Center Zoning District and the Character Based Zoning District is an overlay on top of it. She said it is much stricter, which is why we are spending more time reviewing it under Article 13, then just Village Center regulations. Mr. West clarified their lot sizes are fine. Ms. Patrick agreed, saying one is proposed as 0.43 acres and the other one is 0.38 acres.

Mr. Provost said he was a little confused until he linked the staff comment to the table, which highlighted it was not square footage of the lot that was in question, rather where did they put that house. Mr. York said if they conceded that parking lot and driveway to the Church they would no longer have ¼ acre. Mr. West clarified they are not conceding the parking lot. Mr. Provost agreed, saying they are providing an easement doesn't take away from the property; it just allows somebody to use it. Mr. West stated the Church couldn't sell that; they are just giving them the right to use it.

Mr. Provost said they have the same issue with the side yard because they want it to be within 5' to 25', saying they are at 30' and they will adjust it over to get within that range. He said it behooves them to do that because there are some real nice trees there that they would like to preserve. He said somewhere in there it asked for a 6/12 roof pitch, saying whatever the requirement is they will meet it. Ms. Patrick stated the dimensional standards are on page 19 of the new regulations; noting it is CD3, the rural neighborhood district. Mr. West said it could be anything from a 6/12 to a 12/12, unless it is a hip roof, then it would be a 3/12 minimum. Ms. Patrick said she would get them a copy of the new regulations.

Mr. York asked if there are any runoff or stormwater regulations that apply to the parking lot. Ms. Patrick said they would be subject to stormwater and any grading back there. Mr. Provost said someone mentioned earlier the State permits, saying we are really talking about erosion control, which is prudent to do anyways, and they will do that. He noted that stormwater permits are not required for this. Mr. West said there is no change because right now that is a driveway and a parking lot. He discussed an example where the rules would apply.

Mr. King clarified the only issue would be if it is non-conforming to have a parking lot there. He said he doesn't think we have an issue there. Mr. Provost asked if they are referencing the Church parking lot. Mr. King responded yes. Mr. Provost said they are not touching that. Mr. King agreed, saying it is not a new use, but it is a new lot. He said he doesn't know if that wakes up some regulation, but he doesn't think that it's non-conforming to have that parking lot there. Mr. West stated there are a minimum number of parking spaces, but there aren't a maximum number of parking spaces.

Mr. Provost said Mr. Handy indicated he spoke with someone at the Church and it is six to eight cars. Mr. King said it is bigger than eight cars. Ms. Patrick stated they can fit more, but she thinks they have only noticed that many using the parking lot on Sunday. Mr. Provost said then the question is when did you enact zoning and were they there before that. Mr. King agreed, saying he doesn't think there is any question that it's grandfathered at present. He said what is not clear on is whether the change then wakes up a requirement that require everything on that lot be in conformance with the regulations. He said we will have to check into it.

Mr. Flynn asked if the abutters have been warned. Ms. Patrick said the abutters do not need to be warned for sketch review. Mr. Flynn asked if the new regulations discuss lot coverages. Ms. Patrick said yes, noting it is under lot occupation. She referred to the Table 13.3.3.1(a) on page 19. She stated it lists all the dimensions, noting some examples. Mr. Flynn said with the parking there, they should have some values on the plan. He said it doesn't look like it is anywhere near it, but for the permit. Mr. Provost said he thinks if we get past the conforming issue with the parking lot, then we have to make sure it contributes to no greater than 60% of the lot coverage. He asked if a gravel parking lot is considered coverage. Mr. Flynn responded yes, saying gravel is considered impervious, so it still falls under that.

Mr. York clarified whether the point is that it has to be 60% open. Mr. West it can be 60% covered. Mr. Flynn clarified 60% impervious covered, noting what is included in impervious. Ms. Patrick said it looks like it would be close. The DRB members, Ms. Patrick, and Mr. Provost discussed impervious surfaces further. Ms. Patrick stated this may fall under pre-existing, even though it is a new lot. Mr. King said that is his question. Mr. Provost said he highlighted a plan to show green space, saying if they are over 60% it is not by much. He stated they will calculate that.

Mr. Provost moved to page 4, saying it will be residential in nature. He stated they opted to go with the rear yard parking and two parking spots are provided. He said on page 5 regarding development plans, it says no such proposal currently exists. Mr. Provost asked what the DRB is looking for with regard to a development plan. Ms. Patrick responded that a development plan addresses everything listed in the chart in the staff report is what will have to be addressed and expanded on at the final hearing. She said she only made comments on anything outstanding from her initial overview.

Mr. Provost clarified that no site plan review is required. Ms. Patrick said she was just suggesting the development plan hasn't been submitted. She stated the content that has been crossed out on this chart was for the DRB to see, although it is not relevant to this application. She said something that's helpful is a nice flow chart on page 9 that shows the process. The DRB members noted their charts are gibberish. Ms. Patrick stated all of those are requirements for the development plan, noting this will be the first one submitted. Mr. King clarified the development plan is the application. He said it is just another name for all of the application materials. He stated it is an exhaustive list of what needs to be covered.

Ms. Patrick agreed, noting it will still be subject to subdivision review. She said they will be showing the application meets those rules as well, noting there is some redundancy. Mr. Provost clarified it would be in the form of a narrative with the plans, as well as with the supporting documents. Ms. Patrick said those will all be appendices and will need to be part of the application. She said the subdivision review for the general standards; they are still subject to Section 10 for a minor subdivision. She noted that some of the general standards are covered in Article 13 as well, so there will be a bit of redundancy.

Mr. King said the intent is that the Form-based Code provisions are more specific, but not in contradiction with the other ones. Ms. Patrick agreed, saying if there is some conflict, go with Article 13. Mr. King stated they should be pretty well in line. Mr. Provost said once past sketch review they will get supporting letters, as well as State wastewater permit and any roadway permit they may need. He said on page 6, a private driveway is proposed on Lot 1 shown on the plat. He said the driveway is accompanied by an ingress easement onto Lot 2.

Mr. Provost said they have no opposition for allowing a pedestrian easement in favor of the Town on the front of the property adjacent to Route 15. He asked if that is where it is intended. Mr. King and Mr. West agreed. Mr. Provost said the lot layout will be subject to Character Based Zoning Ordinance (CBZO) standards of review in the development plan, saying they will accommodate that. He moved to page 7, asking if the Town's public works gives out an allocation that helps them to go to potable water and wastewater at the State level. Mr. Flynn said he doesn't think so. Mr. King said there is a connection permit for the water district. Mr. Flynn said it is not going to be the same process as other towns. Mr. Provost discussed how it sometimes works between towns and the State. He and the DRB discussed the municipal water district further, including the contact person.

Mr. Provost said the municipal water service line shown on the plat is under Route 15. He said they would like to have the leeway to see if they can connect on this side of the road. Mr. West stated that is all up to them. Mr. King said the only condition we have is that you end up with a potable water supply that is permitted; it is not the Town's jurisdiction. Mr. Provost said staff recommends that the applicant preserve the large trees on Lot 1 and they will. Mr. King said the reconfiguration discussed is to that benefit too. Mr. Provost stated the applicant is subject to the architectural standards of Section 13.5. He stated they will concur anything and supply anything to comply with those standards. He said he noticed in there you also talk about what materials they should use and he doesn't see vinyl siding listed. Mr. Provost clarified you are pushing for wood, cement, brick, or stone. Mr. Flynn agreed, saying there is no vinyl in there.

Mr. Provost stated he always seems to come from the cost perspective. He discussed his experience, standards, and the impact on the cost of houses. He said density helps with affordability, discussing the rationale. Mr. Provost said no lighting is currently proposed on the site, noting he suspects there would be down lighting on the front porch and possibly a spot light on a garage. Ms. Patrick said it is mentioned in the architectural standards. Mr. Provost stated they are not going to be putting spot lights flashing down Route 15. Mr. King said the rules are pretty clear about what is required and what is allowed; there are performance standards about light coming off the property into the street. He said in residential it isn't usually an issue; it is usually only an issue with parking lots and driveways which have street lights.

Mr. Provost said there is a reference to an easement in favor of Vermont 372. He asked if that is the Church. Ms. Patrick agreed. Mr. Flynn noted 372 is the parcel number. Mr. Provost said there is an easement that grants them access to the rear parcel. He said Mr. Handy wants be a good neighbor and does not want to disrupt that. He said they now have to look at lot coverage. Mr. Flynn added one thing relevant to that is it would make it a lot cleaner if they show up at the next hearing with draft legal documents. Mr. Provost clarified those are required for final anyway. Mr. Flynn agreed. Mr. West said if they are doing both together, they will want to have them.

Mr. Provost stated the applicant has indicated all utilities will be underground, adding that on the site they will be underground. He said he is finished with comments regarding the staff report, saying now we need to talk about architectural standards. Mr. King said we have talked about some of it. Mr. West said you blanket agreed to follow Section 13.5, which is all of those architectural requirements. Mr. King said at this point in sketch, it would be appropriate to tell us what your intending to do because there is a lot of variation of options.

Mr. West said right now they are doing a subdivision, not asking to build a building. He asked if it is required to have all of those things in line for the subdivision to go through, or does that wait until they ask for a building permit. Ms. Patrick clarified they have proposed a building on this site. Mr. Provost said it is a very good point because it is in an overlay district which calls for architectural criteria. He, Ms. Patrick, and the DRB members discussed the procedural approach further.

Mr. Provost said he would like the opportunity to say that they are going to accomplish addressing Section 13.5, the architectural requirements before final. He said he would get them a draft of that after speaking with Mr. Handy. Ms. Patrick said when the application comes forth as a subdivision with a proposed building; the DRB approves those architectural standards. She said if you were just coming with a building permit, then staff would review those architectural standards. She explained the approval process further and the applicability to this application.

Mr. King said his understanding was that to do a subdivision under the CBZO, there has to be a design that meets the CBZO. He said if all they need from the DRB is subdivision review. Ms. Patrick said no, they also need to be reviewed under the CBZO, which is why they are submitting the development plan. Mr. West clarified that if anyone in this district wants to subdivide their property, do they already have to have a plan in place according to the new rules. Ms. Patrick said she doesn't know if that is a question she can answer yet. The DRB discussed the process under the new rules further.

Mr. Provost said he is requesting subdivision going from sketch to final, saying they will bring to final the architectural requirements to obtain a building permit in that district. Ms. Patrick clarified it can't happen all at once, saying she cannot issue a building permit at that time. Mr. Provost said he understands. Ms. Patrick said that is what we are discussing, referencing Section 13.1.10.3, which she read from.

Mr. King said he thinks we have covered this enough for purposes of sketch review. He said we will need to be sure that you give the applicant good guidance so they know what to bring to final review. He said he thinks we understand it is combined. Mr. King said the applicant doesn't want to separate the two, but it is important we understand procedurally going forward. Ms. Patrick agreed. She asked if anyone has any concerns about how this is presented for final, noting it is a new kind of application. The consensus of the DRB members was good.

Mr. Provost, Ms. Patrick, and the DRB members discussed the process going forward, including review of the application. Mr. King closed the hearing, saying there is no formal approval process for sketch plan review. He stated the comments and minutes are the output and the applicant should continue to work with staff as we continue to final review.

The Development Review Board entered deliberative session at 8:23 p.m.